

REMARKS

In the Office Action issued June 23, 2005, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Witkowski et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,345,272 (Witkowski).

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify and more distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to define an invention that is novel and unobvious over the prior art. Favorable reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested.

The present invention is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the reference relied upon in the Office Action, as the prior art reference does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 1-15 is not anticipated by Witkowski. Witkowski is directed to rewriting queries that do not use materialized views in order to cause the rewritten query to access the materialized view rather than the table indicated by the original query. In this sense, then, Witkowski merely discloses substituting one table for another.

This is shown by the example in Witkowski discussed by the Examiner. Witkowski discloses aggregate query 210 that requests summary information from sales table 250. Sales table 250 contains columns date 260, region 262, product 264, and \$Amt 266. Query 210 requests summarized data from the \$Amt column of sales table 250, where the \$Amt data is summed by region (SUM(\$Amt), region).

Witkowski discloses query 270, which defines a materialized view (temporary table) of sales table 250 (MVSales 270). MVSales includes a new column, Sum_Sales, that includes summarized data from the \$Amt column of sales table 250. In the column Sum_Sales, the \$Amt data is summed by date and by region (SUM(\$Amt), Date, region). MVSales is not a detail table with respect to \$Amt, as it contains only summary data (SUM(\$Amt)) for this item. Thus, MVSales is an aggregate table.

Witkowski discloses Query 280, which performs the same function, and produces the same result, as Query 250, but which has been rewritten to obtain its data from MVSales, rather than from the table Sales. In this entire process, no tables have been joined. Rather, a summary (aggregate) table, MVSales, was created from the detail table Sales, and the Query was rewritten to obtain the data from MVSales rather than from Sales. There is only one detail table, Sales, used by Witkowski, and, thus, there is no need to join data from a plurality of tables. In fact, there is no possible way to join data from a plurality of detail tables, as there is only one detail table. Even if MVSales is incorrectly considered to be a detail table, it is never joined with any other table. Rather, MVSales is simply substituted for Sales in the rewritten query 280.

By contrast, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, generates a second query adapted to cause the database to aggregate the data within each of the plurality of detail tables as required; and perform a SQL join operation to join the aggregated data from each of the plurality of detail tables, the joined aggregated data representing the selected data. Witkowski discloses substituting an

aggregate table, MVSales, for a detail table, Sales. Witkowski provides no disclosure of aggregating data within each of a plurality of detail tables and performing a SQL join operation to join the aggregated data from each of the plurality of detail tables.

Thus, the present invention according to claim 1, and according to claim 9, which is similar, and according to claims 2-8 and 10-15, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Witkowski.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0045).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz

Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: December 21, 2005

Swidler Berlin LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500